arXiv:1611.04274v1 [math.OA] 14 Nov 2016

Characterizations of Jordan mappings on some rings and algebras through zero products

Wenbo Huang, Jiankui Li* and Jun He

Department of Mathematics, East China University of Science and Technology

Shanghai 200237, China

Abstract

Let $\mathcal{U} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{A} & \mathcal{M} \\ \mathcal{N} & \mathcal{B} \end{bmatrix}$ be a generalized matrix ring, where $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ are 2-torsion free. We prove that if $\phi : \mathcal{U} \to \mathcal{U}$ is an additive mapping such that $\phi(U) \circ V + U \circ \phi(V) = 0$ whenever $UV = VU = 0$, then $\phi = \delta + \eta$, where δ is a Jordan derivation and η is a multiplier. As its applications, we prove that the similar conclusion remains valid on full matrix algebras, unital prime rings with a nontrivial idempotent, unital standard operator algebras, CDCSL algebras and von Neumann algebras.

Keywords: derivation, generalized matrix ring, Jordan derivation, multiplier, von Neumann algebra

Mathematics Subject Classification(2010):16W25; 46L05.

1 Introduction

Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a ring (or algebra) with the unit I. For each A, B in $\mathcal{R}$, We define the *Jordan product* by $A \circ B = AB + BA$, and the *Lie product* by $[A, B] = AB - BA$.

$\mathcal{R}$ is said to be *2-torsion free* if $2A = 0$ implies $A = 0$ for every A in $\mathcal{R}$. Recall that a ring $\mathcal{R}$ is *prime* if $A\mathcal{R}B = \{0\}$ implies that either $A = 0$ or $B = 0$ for each A, B in $\mathcal{R}$, and is *semiprime* if $A\mathcal{R}A = \{0\}$ implies $A = 0$ for every A in $\mathcal{R}$.

Let $\mathcal{M}$ be an $\mathcal{R}$-bimodule. An additive mapping (or linear mapping) η from $\mathcal{R}$ into $\mathcal{M}$ is called a *multiplier* if $\eta(A) = \eta(I)A = A\eta(I)$ for every A in $\mathcal{R}$. An additive mapping (or linear mapping) δ from $\mathcal{R}$ into $\mathcal{M}$ is called a *derivation* if $\delta(AB) =$

*Corresponding author. E-mail address: jiankuili@yahoo.com

$\delta(A)B + A\delta(B)$ for each A, B in $\mathcal{R}$. Let M be an element in $\mathcal{M}$, the mapping $\delta_M : \mathcal{R} \to \mathcal{M},\ A \to \delta_M(A) := [M, A]$, is a derivation. A derivation $\delta : \mathcal{R} \to \mathcal{M}$ is said to be an *inner derivation* when it can be written in the form $\delta = \delta_M$ for some M in $\mathcal{M}$. An fundamental contribution, due to Sakai, states that every derivation on a von Neumann algebra is inner(cf. [25]).

An additive mapping (or linear mapping) δ from $\mathcal{R}$ into $\mathcal{M}$ is called a *Jordan derivation* if $\delta(A^2) = \delta(A)A + A\delta(A)$ for every A in $\mathcal{R}$. Obviously, every derivation is a Jordan derivation, while the converse is in general not true. A classical result of Herstein [18] asserts that every Jordan derivation on a 2-torsion free prime ring is a derivation. In [10], Cusack generalizes the above result to 2-torsion free semiprime rings. In [26], Zhang and Yu show that every Jordan derivation of triangular algebras is a derivation. In [5], Alizadeh shows that every Jordan derivation from full matrix algebras $M_n(\mathcal{A})$ $(n \geq 2)$ into $M_n(\mathcal{M})$ is a derivation, where $\mathcal{A}$ is a unital ring and $\mathcal{M}$ is a 2-torsion free $\mathcal{A}$-bimodule. In [23], Peralta and Russo show that every Jordan derivation from a C*-algebra $\mathcal{A}$ to a Banach $\mathcal{A}$-bimodule is a derivation.

Let $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ be two unital rings, and $\mathcal{M}$ be a unital $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$-bimodule. We say that $\mathcal{M}$ a *left faithful* $\mathcal{A}$-module if $A\mathcal{M} = \{0\}$ implies that $A = 0$ for every $A \in \mathcal{A}$, and $\mathcal{M}$ a *right faithful* $\mathcal{B}$-module if $\mathcal{M}B = \{0\}$ implies that $B = 0$ for every $B \in \mathcal{B}$. If $\mathcal{M}$ is both a left faithful $\mathcal{A}$-module and a right faithful $\mathcal{B}$-module, then we call $\mathcal{M}$ is a untial faithful $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$-bimodule.

A *Morita context* is a set $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N})$ and two mappings σ and ρ, where $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ are two unital rings, $\mathcal{M}$ is a untial faithful $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$-bimodule and $\mathcal{N}$ (not necessarily faithful) is a $(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{A})$-bimodule, $\sigma : \mathcal{M} \bigotimes_{\mathcal{B}} \mathcal{N} \to \mathcal{A}$ and $\rho : \mathcal{N} \bigotimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{B}$ are two homomorphisms satisfying the following commutative diagrams:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{M} \otimes_{\mathcal{B}} \mathcal{N} \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{M} & \xrightarrow{\sigma \otimes I_{\mathcal{M}}} & \mathcal{A} \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{M} \\ {\scriptstyle I_{\mathcal{M}} \otimes \sigma}\downarrow & & \cong \downarrow \\ \mathcal{M} \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{B} & \xrightarrow{\cong} & \mathcal{M}, \end{array}$$

and

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{N} \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{M} \otimes_{\mathcal{B}} \mathcal{N} & \xrightarrow{\rho \otimes I_{\mathcal{N}}} & \mathcal{B} \otimes_{\mathcal{B}} \mathcal{N} \\ {\scriptstyle I_{\mathcal{N}} \otimes \rho}\downarrow & & \cong \downarrow \\ \mathcal{N} \otimes_{\mathcal{B}} \mathcal{A} & \xrightarrow{\cong} & \mathcal{N}. \end{array}$$

These conditions insure that the set

$$\mathcal{U} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{A} & \mathcal{M} \\ \mathcal{N} & \mathcal{B} \end{bmatrix} = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} A & M \\ N & B \end{pmatrix} : A \in \mathcal{A}, M \in \mathcal{M}, N \in \mathcal{N}, B \in \mathcal{B} \right\}$$

forms a ring under usual matrix addition and matrix multiplication if we put $MN = \sigma(M, N)$ and $NM = \rho(N, M)$. We call it a *generalized matrix ring.*

Let $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ be two unital rings, and $\mathcal{M}$ be a unital faithful $(\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B})$-bimodule. The set

$$\mathcal{T}=\left[\begin{array}{cc}\mathcal{A} & \mathcal{M}\\ 0 & \mathcal{B}\end{array}\right]=\left\{\left(\begin{array}{cc}A & M\\ 0 & B\end{array}\right): A\in\mathcal{A}, B\in\mathcal{B}, M\in\mathcal{M}\right\}$$

under the usual matrix addition and matrix multiplication is called a *triangular ring.*

In [1, 2, 3, 6, 5, 7, 16, 20], several authors consider the following conditions on an additive (or a linear) mapping $\phi:\mathcal{R}\to\mathcal{M}$:

$$A,B,C\in\mathcal{R},\quad AB=BC=0\implies A\phi(B)C=0; \tag{$\mathbb{P}_1$}$$

$$A,B\in\mathcal{R},\quad AB=0\implies \phi(A)B+A\phi(B)=0; \tag{$\mathbb{P}_2$}$$

$$A,B\in\mathcal{R},\quad AB=BA=0\implies \phi(A)B+A\phi(B)=0; \tag{$\mathbb{P}_3$}$$

$$A,B\in\mathcal{R},\quad A\circ B=0\implies \phi(A)\circ B+A\circ\phi(B)=0; \tag{$\mathbb{P}_1$}$$

$$A,B\in\mathcal{R},\quad AB=BA=0\Longrightarrow \phi(A)\circ B+A\circ\phi(B)=0; \tag{$\mathbb{P}$}$$

and investigate whether these conditions characterize derivations or Jordan derivations.

In [16], Hadwin and Li show that if ϕ is a bounded linear mapping from a unital C*-algebra $\mathcal{A}$ into a Banach $\mathcal{A}$-bimodule $\mathcal{M}$ with $\mathcal{M}^*$ weakly sequentially complete satisfying the condition $(\mathbb{P}_1)$ and $\phi(I)=0$, then ϕ is a derivation.

In [7], An and Hou show that if ϕ is an additive mapping from a unital ring $\mathcal{R}$ with a nontrivial idempotent into itself satisfying the condition $(\mathbb{P}_2)$, then $\phi(R)=\delta(R)+\xi R$, where δ is a derivation on $\mathcal{R}$ and ξ is an element in the center of $\mathcal{R}$.

Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a Banach algebra, and $\mathcal{M}$ be a Banach $\mathcal{A}$-bimodule. Under some mild conditions on $\mathcal{A}$, in [3], Alaminos et al. characterize a bounded linear mapping ϕ from $\mathcal{A}$ into $\mathcal{M}$ satisfying the conditions $(\mathbb{P}_1)$, $(\mathbb{P}_2)$, $(\mathbb{P}_3)$ and $(\mathbb{P}_4)$, respectively.

Obviously, the condition $(\mathbb{P})$ is more general than the conditions $(\mathbb{P}_1)$, $(\mathbb{P}_2)$, $(\mathbb{P}_3)$ and $(\mathbb{P}_4)$. In [2], Alaminos et al. show that if ϕ is a bounded linear mapping from a C*-algebra $\mathcal{A}$ into an essential Banach $\mathcal{A}$-bimodule $\mathcal{M}$ satisfying the condition $(\mathbb{P})$, then $\phi=\delta+\eta$, where δ is a derivation and η is a multiplier. In [20], Liu and Zhang show that if ϕ is a linear mapping from a triangular algebra $\mathcal{A}$ into itself satisfying the condition $(\mathbb{P})$, then $\phi=\delta+\eta$, where δ is a derivation and η is a multiplier.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, our purpose is to characterize an additive mapping $\phi:\mathcal{U}\to\mathcal{U}$ satisfying the condition $(\mathbb{P})$, where $\mathcal{U}$ is a generalized matrix ring with $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ are 2-torsion free. We prove that $\phi=\delta+\eta$, where δ is a Jordan derivation from $\mathcal{U}$ into itself and η is a multiplier from $\mathcal{U}$ into itself. As its applications, we prove that the similar conclusion remains valid on full matrix algebras, unital prime rings with a nontrivial idempotent, unital standard operator algebras, CDCSL algebras and von Neumann algebras. We extend several results in [7, 20].

2 The Main Results

In the section, we assume that $\mathcal{U} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{A} & \mathcal{M} \\ \mathcal{N} & \mathcal{B} \end{bmatrix}$ is a generalized matrix ring, where $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ are 2-torsion free.

We denote by $\mathrm{Z}(\mathcal{U})$ be the center of $\mathcal{U}$. It is well known that

$$Z(\mathcal{U}) = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} A & 0 \\ 0 & B \end{pmatrix} : AM = MB, NA = BN, M \in \mathcal{M}, N \in \mathcal{N} \right\}.$$

Let $I_{\mathcal{A}}$ and $I_{\mathcal{B}}$ be the identities of the rings $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$, respectively. I denotes the identity of $\mathcal{U}$.

In the following, let

$$P_1 = \begin{pmatrix} I_{\mathcal{A}} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, P_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & I_{\mathcal{B}} \end{pmatrix} \quad and \quad \mathcal{U}_{ij} = P_i \mathcal{U} P_j \quad (i, j = 1, 2).$$

It is clear that the generalized matrix ring may be represented as $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{U}_{11} + \mathcal{U}_{12} + \mathcal{U}_{21} + \mathcal{U}_{22}$. Here $\mathcal{U}_{11}$ and $\mathcal{U}_{22}$ are subrings of $\mathcal{U}$ isomorphic to $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$, respectively. $\mathcal{U}_{12}$ is a $(\mathcal{U}_{11}, \mathcal{U}_{22})$-bimodule isomorphic to the $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$-bimodule $\mathcal{M}$, and $\mathcal{U}_{21}$ is a $(\mathcal{U}_{22}, \mathcal{U}_{11})$-bimodule isomorphic to the $(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{A})$-bimodule $\mathcal{N}$.

The following theorem is the main result of the paper.

Theorem 2.1. *Suppose that* $\mathcal{U} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{A} & \mathcal{M} \\ \mathcal{N} & \mathcal{B} \end{bmatrix}$ *is a generalized matrix ring, where* $\mathcal{A}$ *and* $\mathcal{B}$ *are 2-torsion free. If* $\phi : \mathcal{U} \to \mathcal{U}$ *is an additive mapping satisfying the condition* $(\mathbb{P})$, *then there exist a Jordan derivation* δ *from* $\mathcal{U}$ *into itself and a multiplier* η *from* $\mathcal{U}$ *into itself such that* $\phi = \delta + \eta$. *In addition, if* $\phi(I) = 0$, *then* ϕ *is a Jordan derivation.*

To show the result, we need the following several lemmas.

Lemma 2.2. $\phi(I) \in Z(\mathcal{U})$.

Proof. Let P be an arbitrary idempotent in $\mathcal{U}$, and $P(I - P) = (I - P)P = 0$. By assumption, it follows that

$$\phi(P) \circ (I - P) + P \circ \phi(I - P) = 0.$$

Hence

$$2\phi(P) + P\phi(I) + \phi(I)P = 2\phi(P)P + 2P\phi(P).$$

Multiplying the above equality on the left and right by P respectively, we have that

$$P\phi(I) + P\phi(I)P = 2P\phi(P)P$$

and

$$\phi(I)P + P\phi(I)P = 2P\phi(P)P.$$

Thus

$$P\phi(I) = \phi(I)P. \tag{2.1}$$

In particular,

$$\phi(I) = P_1\phi(I)P_1 + P_2\phi(I)P_2. \tag{2.2}$$

Let U_{ij} be any elements in $\mathcal{U}_{ij}$ $(i, j = 1, 2)$, respectively. Since $P_1 + U_{12}$ and $P_2 + U_{21}$ are idempotents in $\mathcal{U}$, we have

$$(P_1 + U_{12})\phi(I) = \phi(I)(P_1 + U_{12})$$

and

$$(P_2 + U_{21})\phi(I) = \phi(I)(P_2 + U_{21}).$$

By (2.1), we have that

$$U_{12}\phi(I) = \phi(I)U_{12} \tag{2.3}$$

and

$$U_{21}\phi(I) = \phi(I)U_{21}. \tag{2.4}$$

By (2.2), (2.3) and (2.4), it follows that

$$P_1\phi(I)P_1U_{12} = U_{12}P_2\phi(I)P_2.$$

Similarly,

$$P_2\phi(I)P_2U_{21} = U_{21}P_1\phi(I)P_1.$$

Hence

$$\phi(I) \in Z(\mathcal{U}).$$

The proof is complete. □

Lemma 2.3. $P_1\phi(P_2)P_1 = P_2\phi(P_1)P_2 = 0$.

Proof. By (2.2), we have that

$$P_1\phi(I)P_1 = P_1\phi(P_1)P_1$$

and

$$P_2\phi(I)P_2 = P_2\phi(P_2)P_2.$$

Hence

$$P_1\phi(P_2)P_1 = P_2\phi(P_1)P_2 = 0.$$

The proof is complete. □

For each U in $\mathcal{U}$, in the following, we define an additive mapping $\varphi : \mathcal{U} \to \mathcal{U}$ by

$$\varphi(U) = \phi(U) - \phi(I)U + [P_1\phi(P_1)P_2 + P_2\phi(P_2)P_1, U].$$

Lemma 2.4. *φ has the following properties:*

(1) $\varphi(P_1) = \varphi(P_2) = 0$;

(2) *φ satisfying the condition* $(\mathbb{P})$.

Proof. By Lemma 2.3, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi(P_1) &= \phi(P_1) - \phi(I)P_1 + [P_1\phi(P_1)P_2 + P_2\phi(P_2)P_1, P_1] \\ &= \phi(P_1) - \phi(I)P_1 + P_2\phi(P_2)P_1 - P_1\phi(P_1)P_2 \\ &= \phi(P_1) - \phi(P_1)P_1 - \phi(P_2)P_1 + P_2\phi(P_2)P_1 - P_1\phi(P_1)P_2 \\ &= \phi(P_1)P_2 - \phi(P_2)P_1 + P_2\phi(P_2)P_1 - P_1\phi(P_1)P_2 \\ &= 0.\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we can show $\varphi(P_2) = 0$. Hence (1) holds.

Let $UV = VU = 0$, by the assumption and Lemma 2.2, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}&\varphi(U) \circ V + U \circ \varphi(V) \\ &\qquad = \phi(U) \circ V + U \circ \phi(V) + [T, U] \circ V + U \circ [T, V] \\ &\qquad = 0 + [T, U] \circ V + U \circ [T, V] \\ &\qquad = 0,\end{aligned}$$

where $T = P_1\phi(P_1)P_2 + P_2\phi(P_2)P_1$. Hence (2) holds. □

Lemma 2.5. *φ has the following properties:*

(1) $\varphi(U_{11}) \in \mathcal{U}_{11}$;

(2) $\varphi(U_{22}) \in \mathcal{U}_{22}$;

(3) $P_1\varphi(U_{12})P_1 = P_2\varphi(U_{12})P_2 = 0$;

(4) $P_1\varphi(U_{21})P_1 = P_2\varphi(U_{21})P_2 = 0$.

Proof. Since $U_{11}P_2 = P_2U_{11} = 0$, by Lemma 2.4, we have that

$$P_2\varphi(U_{11}) + \varphi(U_{11})P_2 = 0. \tag{2.5}$$

Multiplying (2.5) on the left by P_1, we have that

$$P_1\varphi(U_{11})P_2 = 0.$$

Multiplying (2.5) on the right by P_1, we have that

$$P_2\varphi(U_{11})P_1 = 0.$$

Multiplying (2.5) on the left and right by P_2 respectively, we have that

$$P_2\varphi(U_{11})P_2 = 0.$$

Hence we obtain

$$\varphi(U_{11}) \in \mathcal{U}_{11}.$$

Similarly,

$$\varphi(U_{22}) \in \mathcal{U}_{22}.$$

Since $U_{21}U_{21} = U_{21}U_{21} = 0$, we have

$$2\varphi(U_{21})U_{21} + 2U_{21}\varphi(U_{21}) = 0,$$

and

$$(P_2 + U_{21})(P_1 - U_{21}) = (P_1 - U_{21})(P_2 + U_{21}) = 0.$$

We have that

$$P_1\varphi(U_{21}) + \varphi(U_{21})P_1 = P_2\varphi(U_{21}) + \varphi(U_{21})P_2. \tag{2.6}$$

Multiplying (2.6) on the left and right by P_1 respectively, we have that

$$P_1\varphi(U_{21})P_1 = 0.$$

Multiplying (2.6) on the left and right by P_2 respectively, we have

$$P_2\varphi(U_{21})P_2 = 0.$$

Similarly,

$$P_1\varphi(U_{12})P_1 = P_2\varphi(U_{12})P_2 = 0.$$

The proof is complete. □

Lemma 2.6. *Let U_{ij} and V_{ij} be arbitrary elements in $\mathcal{U}_{ij}$ (i,j=1,2), respectively. φ has the following properties:*

(1) $\varphi(U_{11} \circ V_{12}) = \varphi(U_{11}) \circ V_{12} + U_{11} \circ \varphi(V_{12})$;
(2) $\varphi(U_{22} \circ V_{21}) = \varphi(U_{22}) \circ V_{21} + U_{22} \circ \varphi(V_{21})$;
(3) $\varphi(U_{11} \circ V_{21}) = \varphi(U_{11}) \circ V_{21} + U_{11} \circ \varphi(V_{21})$;
(4) $\varphi(U_{22} \circ V_{12}) = \varphi(U_{22}) \circ V_{12} + U_{22} \circ \varphi(V_{12})$;
(5) $\varphi(U_{11} \circ V_{11}) = \varphi(U_{11}) \circ V_{11} + U_{11} \circ \varphi(V_{11})$;
(6) $\varphi(U_{22} \circ V_{22}) = \varphi(U_{22}) \circ V_{22} + U_{22} \circ \varphi(V_{22})$;
(7) $\varphi(U_{12} \circ V_{21}) = \varphi(U_{12}) \circ V_{21} + U_{12} \circ \varphi(V_{21})$;
(8) $\varphi(U_{21} \circ V_{12}) = \varphi(U_{21}) \circ V_{12} + U_{21} \circ \varphi(V_{12})$.

Proof. Since

$$(U_{11} - U_{11}V_{12})(V_{12} + P_2) = (V_{12} + P_2)(U_{11} - U_{11}V_{12}) = 0,$$

by Lemma 2.4, it follows that

$$\varphi(U_{11} - U_{11}V_{12}) \circ (V_{12} + P_2) + (U_{11} - U_{11}V_{12}) \circ \varphi(V_{12} + P_2) = 0.$$

We have that

$$\begin{aligned}(-U_{11}V_{12}\varphi(V_{12}) - \varphi(V_{12})U_{11}V_{12} - V_{12}\varphi(U_{11}V_{12})) + (\varphi(U_{11})V_{12} - \varphi(U_{11}V_{12})P_2 \\ + U_{11}\varphi(V_{12})) + (-P_2\varphi(U_{11}V_{12}) + \varphi(V_{12})U_{11}) + (-\varphi(U_{11}V_{12})V_{12}) \\ = 0.\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 2.5, we have that

$$\varphi(U_{11})V_{12} - \varphi(U_{11}V_{12})P_2 + U_{11}\varphi(V_{12}) \in \mathcal{U}_{12},$$

and

$$-P_2\varphi(U_{11}V_{12}) + \varphi(V_{12})U_{11} \in \mathcal{U}_{21}.$$

Thus

$$\varphi(U_{11})V_{12} - \varphi(U_{11}V_{12})P_2 + U_{11}\varphi(V_{12}) - P_2\varphi(U_{11}V_{12}) + \varphi(V_{12})U_{11} = 0. \tag{2.7}$$

By Lemma 2.5, we have that

$$\varphi(U_{11}V_{12})P_2 + P_2\varphi(U_{11}V_{12}) = \varphi(U_{11}V_{12}). \tag{2.8}$$

By Lemma 2.5, (2.8) and (2.7), we obtain

$$\varphi(U_{11} \circ V_{12}) = \varphi(U_{11}) \circ V_{12} + U_{11} \circ \varphi(V_{12}). \tag{2.9}$$

Hence (1) holds.

Since

$$(V_{21} - P_2)(V_{21}U_{11} + U_{11}) = (V_{21}U_{11} + U_{11})(V_{21} - P_2) = 0,$$

by Lemma 2.4, it follows that

$$\varphi(V_{21} - P_2) \circ (V_{21}U_{11} + U_{11}) + (V_{21} - P_2) \circ \varphi(V_{21}U_{11} + U_{11}) = 0.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}(\varphi(V_{21})V_{21}U_{11} + \varphi(V_{21}U_{11})V_{21}) + (U_{11}\varphi(V_{21}) - \varphi(V_{21}U_{11})P_2) \\ + (\varphi(V_{21})U_{11} - P_2\varphi(V_{21}U_{11}) + V_{21}\varphi(U_{11})) \\ + (V_{21}U_{11}\varphi(V_{21}) + V_{21}\varphi(V_{21}U_{11})) = 0.\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 2.5, we have that

$$U_{11}\varphi(V_{21}) - \varphi(V_{21}U_{11})P_2 \in \mathcal{U}_{12},$$

and

$$\varphi(V_{21})U_{11} - P_2\varphi(V_{21}U_{11}) + V_{21}\varphi(U_{11}) \in \mathcal{U}_{21},$$

it follows that

$$U_{11}\varphi(V_{21}) - \varphi(V_{21}U_{11})P_2 + \varphi(V_{21})U_{11} - P_2\varphi(V_{21}U_{11}) + V_{21}\varphi(U_{11}) = 0. \tag{2.10}$$

By Lemma 2.5, we have that

$$\varphi(V_{21}U_{11})P_2 + P_2\varphi(V_{21}U_{11}) = \varphi(V_{21}U_{11}). \tag{2.11}$$

By Lemma 2.5, (2.10) and (2.11), we obtain

$$\varphi(U_{11} \circ V_{21}) = \varphi(U_{11}) \circ V_{21} + U_{11} \circ \varphi(V_{21}).$$

Hence (3) holds.

Let V_{12} be an arbitrary element in $\mathcal{U}_{12}$. Since

$$\varphi(U_{11}V_{11}V_{12}) = \varphi(U_{11}V_{11} \circ V_{12}),$$

by (2.9), we have that

$$\varphi(U_{11}V_{11}V_{12}) = \varphi(U_{11}V_{11})V_{12} + U_{11}V_{11}\varphi(V_{12}) + \varphi(V_{12})U_{11}V_{11}, \tag{2.12}$$

on the other hand,

$$\varphi(U_{11}V_{11}V_{12}) = \varphi(U_{11} \circ V_{11}V_{12}).$$

By Lemma 2.5 and (2.9) it follows that

$$\varphi(U_{11}V_{11}V_{12}) = \varphi(U_{11})V_{11}V_{12} + U_{11}\varphi(V_{11})V_{12} + U_{11}V_{11}\varphi(V_{12}) + \varphi(V_{12})V_{11}U_{11}. \tag{2.13}$$

By (2.12) and (2.13), we have that

$$(\varphi(U_{11}V_{11}) - \varphi(U_{11})V_{11} - U_{11}\varphi(V_{11}))V_{12} + \varphi(V_{12})U_{11}V_{11} - \varphi(V_{12})V_{11}U_{11} = 0.$$

By Lemma 2.5, we have that

$$(\varphi(U_{11}V_{11}) - \varphi(U_{11})V_{11} - U_{11}\varphi(V_{11}))V_{12} = 0.$$

By assumption, $\mathcal{U}_{12}$ is a left faithful $\mathcal{U}_{11}$-module. It follows that

$$\varphi(U_{11}V_{11}) = \varphi(U_{11})V_{11} + U_{11}\varphi(V_{11}).$$

Hence (5) holds.

Since

$$\begin{aligned}(U_{12}V_{21}+U_{12}+V_{21}+P_2)&(V_{21}U_{12}-V_{21}-U_{12}+P_1)\\ &=(V_{21}U_{12}-V_{21}-U_{12}+P_1)(U_{12}V_{21}+U_{12}+V_{21}+P_2)\\ &=0.\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 2.4, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi(U_{12}V_{21}+U_{12}+V_{21}+P_2)&\circ(V_{21}U_{12}-V_{21}-U_{12}+P_1)\\ &+(U_{12}V_{21}+U_{12}+V_{21}+P_2)\circ\varphi(V_{21}U_{12}-V_{21}-U_{12}+P_1)\\ &=0.\end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}2(\varphi(U_{12}V_{21})&-\varphi(U_{12})V_{21}-U_{12}\varphi(V_{21}))+(-\varphi(U_{12}V_{21})U_{12}\\ &+\varphi(U_{12})V_{21}U_{12}+\varphi(V_{21})V_{21}U_{12}+P_1\varphi(U_{12})+P_1\varphi(V_{21})\\ &+U_{12}\varphi(V_{21}U_{12})-U_{12}V_{21}\varphi(V_{21})-U_{12}V_{21}\varphi(U_{12})-\varphi(V_{21})P_2\\ &-\varphi(U_{12})P_2)+(\varphi(U_{12})P_1+\varphi(V_{21})P_1-V_{21}\varphi(U_{12}V_{21})\\ &+V_{21}U_{12}\varphi(U_{12})+V_{21}U_{12}\varphi(V_{21})-P_2\varphi(V_{21})+\varphi(V_{21}U_{12})V_{21}\\ &-\varphi(V_{21})U_{12}V_{21}-\varphi(U_{12})U_{12}V_{21})+2(\varphi(V_{21}U_{12})-\varphi(V_{21})U_{12}\\ &-V_{21}\varphi(U_{12}))=0.\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 2.5, it follows that

$$0=2(\varphi(U_{12}V_{21})-\varphi(U_{12})V_{21}-U_{12}\varphi(V_{21}))\in\mathcal{U}_{11},$$

and

$$0=2(\varphi(V_{21}U_{12})-\varphi(V_{21})U_{12}-V_{21}\varphi(U_{12})\in\mathcal{U}_{22}.$$

By assumption, $\mathcal{U}_{11}$ and $\mathcal{U}_{22}$ are 2-torsion free. Thus

$$\varphi(U_{12}V_{21})-\varphi(U_{12})V_{21}-U_{12}\varphi(V_{21})=0$$

and

$$\varphi(V_{21}U_{12})-\varphi(V_{21})U_{12}-V_{21}\varphi(U_{12})=0.$$

Hence (7) holds.

Similarly, we can prove that (2), (4), (6) and (8). The proof is complete. □

Lemma 2.7. *φ is a Jordan derivation.*

Proof. By Lemmas 2.5 and 2.6, the conclusion follows. □

Proof of Theorem 2.1. Let U be an arbitrary element in $\mathcal{U}$. We define an additive mapping $\varphi : \mathcal{U} \to \mathcal{U}$ by

$$\varphi(U) = \phi(U) - \phi(I)U + [P_1\phi(P_1)P_2 + P_2\phi(P_2)P_1, U],$$

where $T = P_1\phi(P_1)P_2 + P_2\phi(P_2)P_1$ in $\mathcal{U}$. Then

$$\phi(U) = \varphi(U) - [T, U] + \phi(I)U.$$

We define δ and η from $\mathcal{U}$ into itself by

$$\delta(U) = \varphi(U) - [T, U], \quad \textit{and} \quad \eta(U) = \phi(I)U,$$

it follows that

$$\phi = \delta + \eta.$$

By Lemma 2.7, δ is a Jordan derivation. Hence $\delta(I) = 0$, and $\eta(I) = \phi(I)$. By Lemma 2.2, it follows that η is a multiplier. The proof is complete. □

Corollary 2.8. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a unital ring, and $M_n(\mathcal{A})$, $n \geq 2$, be the full matrix algebra of all $n \times n$ matrices over $\mathcal{A}$. If $\phi : M_n(\mathcal{A}) \to M_n(\mathcal{A})$ is an additive mapping satisfying the condition $(\mathbb{P})$, then there exist a derivation $\delta : M_n(\mathcal{A}) \to M_n(\mathcal{A})$ and a multiplier $\eta : M_n(\mathcal{A}) \to M_n(\mathcal{A})$ such that $\phi = \delta + \eta$. In addition, if $\phi(I) = 0$, then ϕ is a derivation.*

Proof. By Theorem 2.1 and [5, Theorem 3.1], the conclusion follows. □

Corollary 2.9. *Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a 2-torsion free unital prime ring with a nontrivial idempotent P. If $\phi : \mathcal{R} \to \mathcal{R}$ be an additive mapping satisfying the condition $(\mathbb{P})$, then there exist a derivation $\delta : \mathcal{R} \to \mathcal{R}$ and a multiplier $\eta : \mathcal{R} \to \mathcal{R}$ such that $\phi = \delta + \eta$. In addition, if $\phi(I) = 0$, then ϕ is a derivation.*

Proof. By assumption, $\mathcal{R}$ is a prime ring, it follows that $P\mathcal{R}(I - P)$ is a faithful $(P\mathcal{R}P, (I - P)\mathcal{R}(I - P))$-bimodule. Then $\mathcal{R}$ is isomorphic to the generalized matrix ring

$$\begin{bmatrix} P\mathcal{R}P & P\mathcal{R}(I-P) \\ (I-P)\mathcal{R}P & (I-P)\mathcal{R}(I-P) \end{bmatrix}.$$

By Theorem 2.1 and [18, Theorem 3.1], the conclusion follows. □

Let $\mathbf{X}$ be a real or complex Banach space and let $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{X})$ and $\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{X})$ denote the algebra of all bounded linear operators on $\mathbf{X}$ and the ideal of all finite rank operators in $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{X})$, respectively. A subalgebra $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{X})$ of $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{X})$ is said to be *standard* in case $\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{X}) \subset \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{X})$. Obviously, there exist nontrivial idempotents in any standard operator algebra. Any standard operator algebra is prime. We have

Corollary 2.10. *Let* $\mathbf{X}$ *be a real or complex Banach space and let* $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{X})$ *be a unital standard operator algebra on* $\mathbf{X}$*. If* $\phi : \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{X}) \to \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{X})$ *is a linear mapping satisfying the condition* $(\mathbb{P})$*, then there exist a derivation* $\delta : \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{X}) \to \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{X})$ *and a multiplier* $\eta : \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{X}) \to \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{X})$ *such that* $\phi = \delta + \eta$*. In addition, if* $\phi(I) = 0$*, then* ϕ *is a derivation.*

Theorem 2.11. *Suppose that* $\mathcal{T} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{A} & \mathcal{M} \\ 0 & \mathcal{B} \end{bmatrix}$ *is a triangular ring, where* $\mathcal{A}$ *and* $\mathcal{B}$ *are 2-torsion free. If* $\phi : \mathcal{T} \to \mathcal{T}$ *is an additive mapping satisfying the condition* $(\mathbb{P})$*, then there exist a derivation* $\delta : \mathcal{T} \to \mathcal{T}$ *and a multiplier* $\eta : \mathcal{T} \to \mathcal{T}$ *such that* $\phi = \delta + \eta$*. In addition, if* $\phi(I) = 0$*, then* ϕ *is a derivation .*

Proof. The proof is similar to the proof of Theorem 2.1. We leave it to the reader. □

Lemma 2.12. *Let* $\mathcal{A}$ *be an algebra over* $\mathbb{C}$ *with unit* I*. Suppose that* $\mathcal{A} = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \bigoplus \mathcal{A}_i$*, where* $\mathcal{A}_i$ *is a unital subalgebra of* $\mathcal{A}$ *with unit* I_i *for every* $i = 1, 2, \cdots$*. Let* $\phi : \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{A}$ *be a linear mapping satisfying the condition* $(\mathbb{P})$*, then* $\phi(\mathcal{A}_i) \subset \mathcal{A}_i,\ i = 1, 2, \cdots$*.*

Proof. Given any integer i, let $\mathcal{B} = \sum_{j \neq i}^{\infty} \bigoplus \mathcal{A}_j$, then $\mathcal{A} \cong \mathcal{A}_i \bigoplus \mathcal{B}$. By Lemma 2.3, $\phi(I_i) \in \mathcal{A}_i$ and $\phi(I - I_i) \in \mathcal{B}$. Let A be an arbitrary element in $\mathcal{A}_i$, we have that

$$A(I - I_i) = (I - I_i)A = 0.$$

By assumption, it follows that

$$2\phi(A)(I - I_i) + \phi(I - I_i)A + A\phi(I - I_i) = 0.$$

By assumption, it follows that

$$\phi(A)(I - I_i) = 0.$$

Thus

$$\phi(A) \in \mathcal{A}_i.$$

The proof is complete. □

Lemma 2.13. *Let* $\mathcal{A}$ *be an algebra over* $\mathbb{C}$ *with unit* I*. Suppose that* $\mathcal{A} = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \bigoplus \mathcal{A}_i$*, where* $\mathcal{A}_i$ *is a unital subalgebra of* $\mathcal{A}$ *with unit* I_i *for every* $i = 1, 2, \cdots$*. Let* $\phi : \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{A}$ *be a linear mapping satisfying the following conditions:*

(1) $\phi(\mathcal{A}_i) \subset \mathcal{A}_i$;

(2) $\phi|_{\mathcal{A}_i} = \delta_i + \eta_i$*, where* δ_i *is a derivation on* $\mathcal{A}_i$ *and* η_i *is a multiplier on* $\mathcal{A}_i$*, for every* $i = 1, 2 \cdots$ *.*

Then there exist a derivation δ *from* $\mathcal{A}$ *into itself and a multiplier* η *from* $\mathcal{A}$ *into itself, such that* $\phi = \delta + \eta$*.*

Proof. Let A be an arbitrary element in $\mathcal{A}$, then A has the form $A = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \bigoplus A_i$, where $A_i \in \mathcal{A}_i$ for every $i = 1, 2, \cdots$. We define δ and η from $\mathcal{A}$ into itself by

$$\delta(A) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \bigoplus \delta_i(A_i), \text{ and } \eta(A) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \bigoplus \eta_i(A_i).$$

It follows that

$$\phi(A) = \delta(A) + \eta(A).$$

By assumption, we may verify that δ is a derivation and η is a multiplier. □

Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a CDCSL (completely distributive commutative subspace lattice) algebra on a separable Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ (cf. [12]). It is well known (see [21, Lemmas 3 and 4]) that $\mathcal{A} \cong \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \bigoplus \mathcal{A}_i$, where each $\mathcal{A}_i$ is a nest subalgebra of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$.

The following theorem generalizes Corollary 2.5 of [7].

Theorem 2.14. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a CDCSL algebra on a separable Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. If $\phi : \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{A}$ is a linear mapping satisfying the condition $(\mathbb{P})$, then there exist a derivation $\delta : \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{A}$ and a multiplier $\eta : \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{A}$ such that $\phi = \delta + \eta$. In addition, if $\phi(I) = 0$, then ϕ is a derivation.*

Proof. By Corollary 2.10, Theorem 2.11, Lemmas 2.12 and 2.13, the conclusion follows. □

Lemma 2.15. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be an abelian von Neumann algebra. If $\phi : \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{A}$ is a linear mapping satisfying the condition $(\mathbb{P})$, then ϕ is a multiplier.*

Proof. By assumption, $\mathcal{A}$ is an abelian von Neumann algebra. It is well known that([19, Theorem 5.2.1]) $\mathcal{A}$ is $*$-isomorphic to the algebra $C(\Omega)$, where Ω is an extremely disconnected Hausdorff space. If $A, B \in \mathcal{A}$ with $AB = 0$, then the supports of A and B are disadjoint. So

$$\phi(A)B + A\phi(B) = 0$$

implies that

$$\phi(A)B = A\phi(B) = 0.$$

It follows that, ϕ is a linear annihilator-preserving mapping (cf. [22]). By [13, Corollary 2.6], ϕ is a multiplier from $\mathcal{A}$ into itself. □

The following theorem generalizes Corollary 2.3 of [7].

Theorem 2.16. *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a von Neumann algebra. If $\phi : \mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{M}$ is a linear mapping satisfying the condition $(\mathbb{P})$, then there exist an inner derivation $\delta : \mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{M}$ and a multiplier $\eta : \mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{M}$ such that $\phi = \delta + \eta$. In addition, if $\phi(I) = 0$, then ϕ is an inner derivation.*

Proof. We denote $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{A} \bigoplus \mathcal{B}$, where $\mathcal{A} = 0$ or a von Neumann algebra of type I_1 and $\mathcal{B} = 0$ or a von Neumann algebra has no direct summand of type I_1.

Suppose that $\mathcal{B} \neq 0$, by Lemma 2.12, $\phi(\mathcal{B}) \subset \mathcal{B}$. By Lemmas 2.13 and 2.15, we only need to show that there exist a derivation δ_2 on $\mathcal{B}$ and a multiplier η_2 on $\mathcal{B}$, such that $\phi|_{\mathcal{B}} = \delta_2 + \eta_2$.

We denote $I_{\mathcal{B}}$ be the unit of $\mathcal{B}$. For any $A \in \mathcal{B}$, we denote the central carrier of A by C_A. It is well known that there exists a projection P in $\mathcal{B}$ such that $C_P = C_{I_{\mathcal{B}}-P} = I_{\mathcal{B}}$ (cf. [19, chapters 5 and 6]). Hence $P\mathcal{B}(I_{\mathcal{B}} - P)$ is a faithful $(P\mathcal{B}P, (I_{\mathcal{B}} - P)\mathcal{B}(I_{\mathcal{B}} - P))$ -bimodule. It is clear that $\mathcal{B}$ is algebraic isomorphic to the generalized matrix ring

$$\begin{bmatrix} P\mathcal{B}P & P\mathcal{B}(I_{\mathcal{B}} - P) \\ (I_{\mathcal{B}} - P)\mathcal{B}P & (I_{\mathcal{B}} - P)\mathcal{B}(I_{\mathcal{B}} - P) \end{bmatrix}.$$

By Theorem 2.1 and [23, Corollary 17], there exist a derivation δ_2 on $\mathcal{B}$ and a multiplier η_2 on $\mathcal{B}$ such that $\phi|_{\mathcal{B}} = \delta_2 + \eta_2$. By Lemmas 2.13, 2.15 and [25, Theorem 4.1.6], the conclusion follows. □

Remark In [2, Theorem 4.1], Alaminos et al. show that if ϕ is a bounded linear mapping from a C*-algebra $\mathcal{A}$ into an essential Banach $\mathcal{A}$-bimodule $\mathcal{M}$ satisfying the condition $(\mathbb{P})$, then $\phi = \delta + \eta$, where δ is a derivation and η is a multiplier. Theorem 2.16 tells that for the case of von Neumann algebra, the condition of boundness is not necessary.

Acknowledgements. This paper was partially supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China(Grant No. 11371136).

References

[1] J. Alaminos, M. Brešar, J. Extremera, A. Villena, *Characterizing homomorphisms and derivations on C^*-algebras,* Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinb. 137A,(2007), 1-7.

[2] J. Alaminos, M. Brešar, J. Extermera, R. Villena, *Characterizing Jordan maps on C^*-algebras through zero products,* Proc. Edinburgh Math. Soc. 53(2010), 543-555.

[3] J. Alaminos, M. Brešar, J. Extremera, A. Villena, *Maps preserving zero products,* Studia Math. 193(2009), 131-159.

[4] R. Alizadeh, *Jordan derivations of full matrix algebras,* Linear Algebra Appl. 430(2009), 574-578.

[5] G. An, J. Li, J. He, *Jordan product determined by zero products,* Linear Algebra Appl. 475(2015), 90-93.

[6] G. An, J. Li, *Characterizations of linear mappings through zero products or zero Jordan products,* Electron. J. Linear Algebra. 31(2016), 408-424.

[7] R. An, J. Hou, *Characterizations of Jordan derivations on rings with idempotent,* Linear Multilinear Algebra. 58(2010), 753-763.

[8] M. Brešar, J. Vukman, *Jordan derivations on prime rings*, Bull. Austral. Math. Soc. 37(1988), 321-322.

[9] M. Brešar, *Jordan derivations on semiprime rings*, Bull. Austral. Math. Soc. 104(1988), 1003-1006.

[10] J. Cusack, *Jordan derivations on rings*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 53(1975), 321-324.

[11] H. Dales, *Banach algebras and automatically continuous*, London Mathematical Society Monographs 24, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 2000.

[12] K. Davidson, *Nest algebras*, Pitman Research Notes in Math Series 191(1988).

[13] A. Essalen, A. Peralta, M. Ramirez, *Weak-local derivations and homomorphisms on C^*-algebras*, Linear Multilinear Algebra. 64(2016), 169-186.

[14] F. Gilfeather, R. Moore, *Isomorphisms of certain CSL algebras*, J. Func. Anal. 67(1986), 264-291.

[15] S. Goldstein, A. Paszkiewicz, *Linear combinations of projections in von Neumann algebras*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 116(1992), 175-183.

[16] D. Hadwin, J. Li, *Local derivations and local automorphisms,* J. Math. Anal. Appl. 290(2003), 702-714.

[17] D. Hadwin, J. Li, *Local derivations and local automorphisms on some algebras,* J. Operator Theory 60(2008), 29-44.

[18] I. Herstein, *Jordan derivations of prime rings*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 8,(1957), 1104-1110.

[19] R. Kadison, J. Ringrose, *Fundamentals of the Theory of Operator Algebras*, Academic Press Inc. 1983.

[20] D. Liu, J. Zhang, *Jordan derivable maps on triangular algebras by commutative zero products,* Acta Math. Sin. Chin. Ser. 57(2014), 1203-1208.

[21] F. Lu, *Lie derivations of certain CSL algebras*, Israel. J. Math. 155(2006), 149-156.

[22] J. Li, Z. Pan, *Annihilator-preserving maps, multipliers, and derivations,* Linear Algebra Appl. 432(2010), 5-13.

[23] A. Peralta, B. Russo, *Automatic continuity of derivations on C*-algebras and JB*-triples,* Journal of Algebra. 399(2014), 960-977.

[24] J. Ringrose, *Automatically continuous of derivations of operator algebras*, J. London Math. Soc. 5(1972), 432-438.

[25] S. Sakai, *C^*-algebras and W^*- algebras*, Springer-Verlag. 1971.

[26] J. Zhang, W. Yu, *Jordan derivations of triangular algebras,* Linear Algebra Appl. 419(2006), 251-255.